



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,197	11/28/2001	Srikanth Gummadi	TI-33211	1292
23494	7590	03/29/2005		
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999 DALLAS, TX 75265			EXAMINER CORRIELUS, JEAN B	
			ART UNIT 2637	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. <span style="float: right;">8</span> 09/996,197	Applicant(s) GUMMADI ET AL.	
	Examiner Jean B Corrielus	Art Unit 2637	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 15-24 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 9-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 November 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Drawings***

1. Figures 2-6 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.121(d)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claim 12, line 2, "can change" should be changed to "is changed". Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Double Patenting***

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-4 and 10-14 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 8-10 of copending Application No. 10/085,562. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 1 of the application is encompassed by claim 1 of the co-pending application as all limitation of claim 1 of the application are included in claim 1 of the co-pending application. Hence, claim 1 of the application is the broader version of claim 1 of the copending application. Given that, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art to present the claim of the application as a variation of the claim of the co-pending application as such modification would have only provided an alternate way to claim the invention in such a way as to broaden the scope of the claim.

Claim 2 is the same as claim 8 of the copending application. The same analysis applies.

Claim 3 is the same as claim 9 of the copending application. The same analysis applies.

Claim 4 is the same as claim 10 of the copending application. The same analysis applies.

As per claim 10, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art to combine the correlation result so as to generate a single correlation indicating of the entire received sequence.

As per claim 11, it would have been obvious that the threshold would have been predetermined so as to ensure that only accurate correlation signals are generated.

As per claim 12, it would have been obvious that the threshold is adaptive and its value is changed depending on network conditions so as to improve system stability.

As per claim 13, it would have been obvious that the boundary detection would have been performed after each sample value is received so as to satisfy system requirements.

As per claim 14, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art that the boundary detection would have been performed after a specified number of sample value is received so as to satisfy system requirements.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2637

6. Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by applicant's background of the invention and admitted prior art figs. 1-6.

As per claim 1, applicant background of the invention and admitted prior art figs. 1-6 disclose a method and apparatus (fig. 6) comprising receiving the stream of digital sample values fig. 2; correlating a digital sample value with a plurality of received digital sample values 610; calculating a correlation value based on the correlation 620; comparing the correlation value against a threshold, and determining the presence of the boundary based on the comparison see page 2, line 29-page 3, line2.

As per claim 2, the plurality of received digital sample values are selected from the received stream based on their position in different periods of a periodic sequence see fig. 6.

As per claim 9, the received stream is stored in memory see page 13, lines 13-15, and wherein the correlating step comprises: comparing the digital sample value with the plurality of received digital sample values; generating a one value for each time the digital sample value matches with one of the digital sample values in the plurality; and generating a zero value for each time the digital sample value does not match with one of the digital sample values in the plurality see page 14, lines 10-13.

As per claim 10 the calculating step comprises 2 summing up a correlation result resulting from each correlation of the digital sample value with the plurality of previously received digital sample values see adder 620.

As per claim 11, the threshold is predetermined. See page 2, line 21.

As per claim 13, the boundary detection is performed after each sample value is received. See page 3, line 4-6.

As per claim 14, the boundary detection is performed after a specified number of sample values is received see page 3, lines 6-9.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's background of the invention.

Applicant's background of the invention teaches substantially every feature of the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach that the threshold is adaptive and its value (can) is change(d) depending on network conditions. However, such limitation is old and well established in the art. It would have been obvious to one skill in the art to incorporate such a limitation in applicant's background of the invention so as to improve system stability.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Art Unit: 2637


9. Claims 5-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. Claims 15-24 are allowed.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean B Corrielus whose telephone number is 571-272-3020. The examiner can normally be reached on Maxi-Flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel can be reached on 571-272-3086. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Jean B Corrielus  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2637

3/19/05